UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,488	11/02/2000	Paul J. Russell	CIS00-3505	4837

7590 04/23/2004

Barry W Chapin Esq
CHAPIN & HUANG LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER	
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/704,488	Applicant(s) RUSSELL, PAUL J.	
	Examiner Benjamin R Bruckart	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 March 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *18 and 37* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,7,9-13,16,17,19-21,25-31,34-36 and 38-50* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3-6, 8, 14, 15, 22-24, 32, 33* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-50 are pending in this action.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection is withdrawn on claims 1, 5, and 8.

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-13, 16-17, 19-21, 25-31, 34-36, 38-43 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,460 by Simonoff.

Claims 44-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,460 by Simonoff.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 7, 9-13, 16-17, 19-21, 25-31, 34-36, 38-43 filed in the amendment filed March 3, 2004, Paper No. 3, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reasons are set forth below.

Applicant's arguments see Paper No. 3, filed March 3, 2004, with respect to 3-6, 8, 14, 15, 18, 22-24, 32, 33, 37 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 102(e) has been withdrawn.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

The rejections of claims 1-2, 7, 9-13, 16-17, 19-21, 25-31, 34-36, 38-43 are below with updated citations.

Regarding claim 1, in a client computer system, a method for defining objects, the method comprising the steps of (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56):

providing a local object specification to a server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3; client sends local object to server) and

receiving a global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; client receives objects from the server), the global object specification including at least one global object definition having a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50; lines 65- col. 19, line 17; local objects uploaded to the server are global objects; they are referenced by a global key).

generating a signal indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 39-42; server generates indicator that update has been made of common object).

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1 wherein the step of providing the local object specification to the server includes the steps of (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3):

reserving an object creation right with the server (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 22-30);

in response to reserving the object creation right with the server, defining the local object specification to include at least one local object definition and a corresponding local object identification that is unique to the at least one local object on the client (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-33; wrapper assigned a unique identifier so that it is locally identified); and

transferring the local object specification to the server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3).

Regarding claim 7, the method of claim 1 wherein the step of receiving the global object specification receives a global object specification containing global object definitions that correspond to respective local object definitions in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 31-42), the global object definitions having respective global object identifications that are unique amongst all global object definitions created by the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50, lines 65- col. 19, line 7).

Regarding claim 9, in a server computer system, a method for defining objects, the method comprising the steps of (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56):

receiving a local object specification from a client (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3);

for each local object definition in the local object specification, defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50; lines 65- col. 19, line 17; local objects uploaded to the server are global objects; they are referenced by a global key); and

providing the global object specification to the client (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 9 wherein the step of defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification comprises the steps of (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50; lines 65- col. 19, line 17; local objects uploaded to the server are global objects; they are referenced by a global key):

creating a global object definition that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50; lines 65- col. 19, line 17; local objects uploaded to the server are global objects; they are referenced by a global key);

generating an object identification for the unique global object identification that is unique amongst all global object identifications assigned to any existing global object definitions known to the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50; lines 65- col. 19, line 17; col. 16, lines 25-29); and

assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition such that the global object definition is uniquely identified amongst all global object definitions (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50; lines 65- col. 19, line 17).

Regarding claim 11, the method of claim 10 wherein the step of creating a global object definition that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds comprises the step of:

copying the local object definition in the local object specification to a global object definition within the global object specification to generate the global object definition which is a copy of the local object definition (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50; lines 65- col. 19, line 17); and

wherein the step of assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition replaces the local object identification copied to the global object definition with the unique global object identification generated by the step of generating an object identification for the unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50; lines 65- col. 19, line 17).

Regarding claim 12, the method of claim 9 further including the step of:

associating the global object definition to the global object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49; the global object is uploaded from the client).

Regarding claim 13, the method of claim 9 further comprising the steps of:

receiving, from a client, a request to reserve an object creation right on the server (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 22-30); and

checking if the client is able to create an object on the server, and if the client is able to create an object on the server, returning an object creation right to the client (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 22-30; client is able to log in), and

if the client is not able to create an object on the server, providing a denial of the object creation right to the client (col. 15, lines 36-42).

Regarding claim 16, the method of claim 9 further comprising the steps of:

receiving a confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification provided to the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 1-11; server multicasts the updated object); and

providing a global object specification update to other clients such that the other clients can retrieve the global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 17, the method of claim 16 further comprising the steps of:

receiving a request from the other clients for the global object specification (Simonoff: col. 24, lines 53-66); and

in response to receiving the request from the other clients for the global object specification, providing the global object specification to the other clients (Simonoff: col. 24, lines 53-66).

Regarding claim 19,

The Simonoff reference teaches a client computer system comprising:

an interface (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 50-54);

a processor (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 24; computers are composed of a cpu, col. 8, line 66);

a memory system (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 24; computers are composed of memory; col. 8, line 61); and

an interconnection mechanism coupling the interface, the processor and the memory system (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 24-29);

wherein the memory system is encoded with an client object manager process that, when performed on the processor (Simonoff: col. 9, line 46-57), operates as a client to cause the client computer system to define shared objects by performing the operations of (Simonoff: col. 9, line 46-57):

providing a local object specification defined in the memory system to a server via the interface (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6);

receiving, in the memory system, a global object specification from the server via the interface (Simonoff: col. 9, line 46-57); and

generating a signal in the memory system indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions having respective unique object identifiers (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50; lines 65- col. 19, line 17; local objects uploaded to the server are global objects; they are referenced by a global key).

Regarding claim 20, the client computer system of claim 19 wherein when the processor performs the operation of providing the local object specification to the server, the processor further performs the operations of (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6):

reserving an object creation right with the server (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 22-30); and

in response to reserving the object creation right with the server, defining a local object specification in the memory system to include at least one local object definition and a corresponding local object identification that is unique to the at least one local object on the client (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29); and

transferring the local object specification to the server via the interface (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3).

Regarding claim 21, the client computer system of claim 20 wherein when the processor performs the operation of reserving an object creation right with the server (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 22-30; col. 18, lines 12-31), the processor further performs the operations of:

checking for an existence of an object specification on the server (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 22-30; check if logged in), and if no object specification exists on the server (if not logged in), creating a reservation object specification on the server in order to reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 22-30; attempting to log in and collaborate), and if an object specification exists on the server, receiving, via the interface, a denial of the object creation right for the client (Simonoff: col. 15, lines 36-42).

Regarding claim 25, the client computer system of claim 19 wherein when the processor performs the operation of receiving the global object specification the processor performs the operation of:

receiving, via the interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63), a global object specification containing global object definitions that correspond to respective local object definitions in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6), the global object definitions having respective global object identifications that are unique amongst all global object definitions created by the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 26, the client computer system of claim 25 wherein:

the client is client collaboration software performing on a client computer system involved in a collaboration session with the server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 57-63);

the server is collaboration adapter software operating on a collaboration computer system (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; Figures 2 and 3); and

wherein the processor further performs the operation of:

in response to determining that the server properly created the global object specification, providing confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification to the server via the interface such that the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 1-11) can update the global object specification of other client computer systems performing client collaboration software such that all clients involved in the collaboration session with the server contain the global object definitions having unique global object identifications (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 32-43).

Regarding claim 27, a server computer system comprising:

an interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62,63);

a processor (Simonoff: col. 8, line 61);

a memory system (Simonoff: col. 8, line 61); and

an interconnection mechanism coupling the interface, the processor and the memory system (Simonoff: col. 8, line 62);

wherein the memory system is encoded with a server object manager process that, when performed on the processor, operates as a server to cause the server computer system to define objects by performing the operations of (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56):

receiving a local object specification from a client via the interface (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 55- col. 7, line 3);

for each local object definition in the local object specification, defining, within a global object specification in the memory system, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 39-42; server generates indicator that update has been made of common object); and

providing the global object specification from the memory system to the client via the interface (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6).

Regarding claim 28, the server computer system of claim 27 wherein when the processor performs the operation of defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification the processor performs the operations of (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49; server tracks object in vector with unique lookup key):

creating a global object definition in the memory system that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds (Simonoff: col. 10, lines 2-12; teaches uploading to the server; col. 16, lines 41-49 teaches placing the object in a vector with time stamp and order information); and

generating an object identification for the unique global object identification that is unique amongst all global object identifications assigned to any existing global object definitions known to the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49; col. 18, lines 44-50); and

assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition in the memory system such that the global object definition is uniquely identified amongst all global object definitions in the memory system (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 29, the server computer system of claim 28 wherein when the processor performs the operation of creating a global object definition that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds the processor performs the operations of (Simonoff: col. 10, lines 2-12; col. 16, lines 41-49):

copying the local object definition in the local object specification to a global object definition within the global object specification to generate the global object definition which is a copy of the local object definition (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 39-55); and

wherein the step of assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition replaces the local object identification copied to the global object definition with the unique global object identification generated by the step of generating an object identification for the unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 44-50, 66- col. 19, line 17).

Regarding claim 30, the server computer system of claim 29 wherein the processor further performs the operation of associating the global object definition to the global object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49; the global object is the local object on the server and the global specification is the vector or list of objects and their information).

Regarding claim 31, the server computer system of claim 27 wherein the processor further performs the operations of:

receiving, from a client, a request to reserve an object creation right on the server (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 22-30); and

checking if the client is able to create an object on the server, and if the client is able to create an object on the server, returning an object creation right to the client (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 12-31; logging in), and

if the client is not able to create an object on the server, providing a denial of the object creation right to the client (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 22-30; another opportunity to log in).

Regarding claim 34, the server computer system of claim 27 wherein the processor further performs the operations of:

receiving, via the interface from the client (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63), a confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification provided to the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 1-11); and

providing a global object specification update, via the interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63) to other clients such that the other clients can retrieve the global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 35, the server computer system of claim 27 wherein the processor further performs the operations of:

receiving, via the interface, a request from the other clients for the global object specification in the memory system (Simonoff: col. 24, lines 53-64); and

in response to receiving the request from the other clients for the global object specification, providing the global object specification in the memory system to the other clients via the interface (Simonoff: col. 24, lines 53-64).

Regarding claim 36, the server computer system of claim 27 wherein the server computer system is a collaboration server and wherein the server object manager process encoded in the memory system is server collaboration software that (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 19-24), when performed on the processor, operates as a collaboration server to allow distribution of the global object specification to multiple client computer systems involved in a collaboration session (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 8, lines 19-24).

Regarding claim 38, a computer program product having a computer-readable medium including computer program logic encoded thereon for defining objects in a client (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56), such that the computer program logic, when performed on at least one processor within a client computer system, causes the at least one processor to perform the operations of:

providing a local object specification to a server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66- col. 7, line 2);

receiving a global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6); and

generating a signal indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions having respective unique object identifiers (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 39-42; server generates indicator that update has been made of common object).

Regarding claim 39, a computer program product having a computer-readable medium including computer program logic encoded thereon for defining objects in a server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56), such that the computer program logic, when performed on at least one processor within a server computer system, causes the at least one processor to perform the operations of:

receiving a local object specification from a client (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6);

for each local object definition in the local object specification, defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49; col. 18, lines 44-50); and

providing the global object specification to the client (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6).

Regarding claim 40, the computer program product of claim 39 wherein the computer program logic that causes the at least one processor to perform the operation of defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49), comprises computer program logic that when performed on the processor, causes the at least one processor to perform the operations of:

creating a global object definition that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds (Simonoff: col. 10, lines 2-12; teaches uploading to the server; col. 16, lines 41-49 teaches placing the object in a vector with time stamp and order information);

generating an object identification for the unique global object identification that is unique amongst all global object identifications assigned to any existing global object definitions known to the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49; col. 18, lines 44-50); and

assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition such that the global object definition is uniquely identified amongst all global object definitions (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49; col. 18, lines 44-50).

Regarding claim 41, in a client computer system, a method for performing object operations, the method comprising the steps of:

providing an object operation to a server from a client performing on the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66- col. 7, line 2);

receiving, at the client, a global object specification update from the server, the global object specification update indicating that the server performed the object operation on a global object specification maintained by the server (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 19, lines 31-42); and

in response to receiving the global object specification update, performing the object operation on a global object specification maintained by the client (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 31-42).

Regarding claim 42, the method of claim of claim 41 wherein the object operation is a create object operation, and wherein the step of providing the object operation to a server comprises the steps of:

defining at least one object property for a global object definition to be created by the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 21-25);

providing the object operation to the server including the at least one object property (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 33-36); and

wherein the step of receiving receives the global object specification update containing a new global object identification for a new global object definition to be created in the global object specification in the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49); and

wherein the step of performing the object operation on a global object specification maintained by the client includes the steps of:

generating the global object definition within the global object specification on the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 39-42; the global key is looked up), the global object definition containing the at least one object property and containing the global object identification received from the global object specification update (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 1–10, lines 31-42).

Regarding claim 43, the method of claim of claim 41 wherein the object operation is a delete object operation, and wherein the step of providing the object operation to a server comprises the steps of:

defining at least one object property for a global object definition to be deleted from a global object specification maintained by the server (Simonoff: col. 13, lines 22-27);

providing the object operation to the server including the at least one object property (Simonoff: col. 13, lines 22-27; reposting); and

wherein the step of receiving receives the global object specification update containing a global object identification of an existing global object definition in the global object specification in the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 32-41); and

wherein the step of performing the object operation on a global object specification maintained by the client includes the steps of:

removing a global object definition within the global object specification that corresponds to the global object identification received from the global object specification update (Simonoff: col. 13, lines 22-27).

Claims 44-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,460 by Simonoff.

Regarding claim 44, in a client computer system, a method for defining objects (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56), the method comprising the steps of:

from the client computer system:

providing a local object specification to a server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66- col. 7, line 2), the local object specification including at least one local object definition generated by the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 8-24);

at the client computer system:

receiving a global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6), the global object specification including at least one global object definition having a unique global object identification associated with the at least one global object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49; col. 18, lines 32-50), the unique global object identification generated by the server being different than a client generated identifier provided with the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49); and

generating a signal indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification include at least one matching object definition (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 39-42; server generates indicator that update has been made of common object).

Regarding claim 45, a method as in claim 44, wherein generating the signal includes:

at the client computer system, comparing the at least one local object definition in the local object specification to the at least one global object definition in the global object specification to identify whether the

server properly created the global object specification (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 31-42; if properly created update made and in col. 18, lines 1-11, verification is made when the update is multicasted).

Regarding claim 46, a method as in claim 45 further comprising:

checking whether the global object specification contains a corresponding global object definition for each respective local object defined in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 39-59); and

if the global object specification contains a corresponding global object definition for reach respective local object defined in the local object specification, replacing the local object specification in the client with the global object specification received from the server (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 31-42; making the update).

Regarding claim 47, a method as in claim 46 further comprising:

if the global object specification does not contain a corresponding global object definition for each respective local object defined in the local object specification, providing the indication of an error to the server.

Regarding claim 48, a method as in claim 1 further comprising:

ensuring that the server properly creates and manages a precise set of objects the client computer system provides the server by, at the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 39-59; client stores its own copy and can replay events and updates):

comparing the local object specification provided to the server with the global object specification received from the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 1-11; when update is made, the update is multi-casted to all computer); and

utilizing the unique global object identification provided by the server to identify the global object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49, lines 18, lines 32-43).

Regarding claim 49, a method as in claim 1 further comprising:

providing a high degree of certainty that the unique object identification, as generated by the server, is unique across all clients that access an object definition associated with corresponding unique object identification (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 32-50, lines 65- col. 19, line 17).

Regarding claim 50, a method as in claim 9, wherein defining a corresponding global object definition includes:

at the server computer, replacing an identifier associated with the received local object specification with the unique global object identification so that an object specification associated with the received local object specification is globally unique (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 24-29 the object is placed in a wrapper and sent to the server. The server stores a unique hashing lookup key col. 16, lines 41-49 with the object and the global key associated with the object col. 18, lines 32-50 is used); and

providing the unique global object identification along with the global object specification to the client (Simonoff: col. 19, lines 31-42).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18 and 37 are allowed. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Evaluation of claims 18 and 37 in light of applicant's arguments both contain the limitations "providing an error from the client indicating the server improperly created the global object specification." The Simonoff reference, with respect to the step of "defining shared objects between a client and a server and generates an indicating signal when the local and global objects are common" does not teach singly or in combination "providing an error from the client indicating the server improperly created the global object specification."

Claims 3-6, 8, 14, 15, 22-24, 32, 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Evaluation of claims 3, 32, and 33 in light of applicant's arguments both contain the limitations "reserving an object creation right with the server on behalf of the client." The Simonoff reference, with respect to the step of "denying the object creation right on behalf of the client" does not singly or in combination teach this limitation.

Evaluation of claims 4 and 22 do not singly or in combination teach the step of "providing an error to the server if the global object definition does not contain a corresponding global object definition."

Evaluation of claims 5, 8 and 23 do not singly or in combination teach the step of "providing a confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification to the server to indicate to the server to send..."

Therefore claims 6 and 24 are further defining limitations of claims 5 and claim 24, which provides an indication to the server to delete a reservation object.

Evaluation of claims 14 and 15, in light of the applicant's arguments, the Simonoff reference does not singly or in combination teach the step of "requesting to reserve object creation right on behalf of the client."

The Applicant Argues:

With respect to claim 1, applicant argues the cited reference Simonoff does not teach "generating a signal indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions."

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Simonoff reference does teach every aspect of claim 1. Simonoff teaches generating an indication when in col. 19, lines 39-42 when a client receives the update. The client looks up the object's wrapper and makes the change. The received update is part of the global object specification. The local object specification is the object locally stored on the client that is updated through the progression of changes stored in the vector (col. 16, lines 41-49). The examiner understands applicant's arguments as cited in the Remarks of the amendment but the claimed limitations are broad.

With respect to claim 2, applicant argues the cited reference Simonoff does not teach "reserving an object creation right with the server."

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Simonoff reference teaches reserving an object creation right with the server in col. 17, lines 22-30. Examiner interprets reserving an object creation right with the server as joining a collaborative session (through log in) in order to send objects to the server as part of the client's collaboration. Claim 2 does not rely on claim 3.

With respect to claim 9, 27, and 39; applicant argues the invention distinguishes over the cited reference Simonoff because Simonoff does not teach "a server computer system" that defines "a unique global object identification."

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The examiner feels Simonoff teaches the limitations "a server computer system" in col. 16, lines 41-49 that defines "a unique global object identification" in col. 18, lines 44-49, lines 65- col. 19, line 7. The server is shown to give a unique global object identification that is the displayed in col. 19, line 5. The global key is used when updating to clients.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

With respect to claims 44-50, applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155
brb BRB
April 22, 2004

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER